

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-8 and 11-13 have been amended. New claims 14 and 15 have been added.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,249,740 to Ito et al. (hereinafter "Ito"). Claims 1, 12 and 13 have been amended and, for the following reasons, the rejection has been rendered moot.

As amended, claim 1 requires two separate and *different* digital maps. Location information is created based on the first digital map and transmitted. The location information includes a list of points representing a road shape of a road segment, and attribute information on the points. The second map includes data representing the road segment, said data being *different* from the list of points. For example, as described in the specification of the instant application, an information provider could transmit information from the first digital map to a receiver in order to report an accident location. Due to various errors that are present in different maps, "different locations on the road could be recognized as the accident location by the car-mounted navigation apparatus retaining a digital map database from Company A and the car-mounted navigation apparatus retaining a digital map database from Company B." (See page 2, line 19 to page 3, line 2.) The presently claimed method is directed to solving this problem.

In contrast to the method of claim 1, Ito does not describe two separate digital maps, each containing different data that describes the same road segment. The Examiner has cited the "navigation data stored in the data base" described at column 3, lines 32-33 of Ito as the "first digital map" of claim 1. Further, as the "second digital map" of claim 1, the Examiner has cited the "detailed navigation data" which is transmitted to the navigation apparatus, as described at column 3, line 30 of Ito. As further described by Ito (column 3, lines 29-34), the "detailed

navigation data” is extracted from “navigation data stored in the data base” and thus, cannot be *different*, as required by amended claim 1.

Further, as now required by amended claim 1, Ito does not teach “performing matching of said points with said data to identify said road segment on the second digital map using coordinates information of the points and the attribute information included in the location information.” Since, as explained in the preceding paragraph, the “detailed navigation data” is derived from the “navigation data,” they are both the *same* data. Thus, as the Examiner applies the disclosure of Ito to claim 1, the navigation device only contains one set of data—the detailed navigation data (cited by the Examiner as the “second digital map”). Therefore, the navigation device of Ito could not perform the matching of the different data and points, as required by claim 1.

Regarding amended claim 12, Ito does not teach two separate digital maps, each containing different data that describes the same road segment, as required by claim 12. See the above-discussion of claim 1.

Regarding amended claim 13, the arguments provided above with respect to claim 1 are also applicable to claim 13.

For at least the above reasons, every limitation of amended claims 1, 12 and 13 is not taught by Ito. Therefore, in view of the amendments, claims 1, 12 and 13, and claims 2, 3, 5–7 and 11, which depend from claim 1, are not fully anticipated and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8–10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,839,087 to Sato. Following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 requires a plurality of points representing a road shape, and that a string of coordinates defines the plurality of points. The claims has been amended to clarify that is the string of coordinates includes an interpolation point ( $P_n$ ) and a preceding interpolation point ( $P_{n-1}$ ). Thus, as claimed, two consecutive interpolation points ( $P_n$  and  $P_{n-1}$ ) are included in a string of coordinates that represent a road shape. Further, claim 8 has been amended to specify that a bearing deviation ( $d_n$ ) is a deviation of the interpolation point ( $P_n$ ) *from the preceding interpolation point* ( $P_{n-1}$ ).

It is respectfully submitted that Sato does not teach a “method for thinning-out a plurality of points representing a road shape” and “providing a string of coordinates defining said plurality of points, said plurality of points including an interpolation point,  $P_n$ , and a preceding interpolation point  $P_{n-1}$ ,” and “determining a bearing deviation,  $d_n$ , of the interpolation point,  $P_n$ , from the preceding interpolation point  $P_{n-1}$ ,” as required. The Examiner cites “the error of compass direction of the present position with respect to the nearest line, that is  $|\theta_s - \theta_a|$ ” as the bearing deviation of claim 8 (see column 3, lines 49–54). It is respectfully pointed out that he “error of compass direction” is not a deviation between two consecutive points in a string of coordinates representing a road shape, as in claim 8. Rather, as shown in FIG. 3, the error of compass direction is measured between two separate lines: 1) a direction ( $\theta_s$ ) of the vehicle’s movement and, 2) an angle ( $\theta_s$ ) of a line at a point ( $P_a$ ) on a line that represents a road segment in map data. Thus, the “error of compass direction” of Saito does not meet all of the limitations of the bearing deviation of claim 8. Therefore, claim 8, and dependent claims 9 and 10, are not fully anticipated by the cited disclosure of Saito, and the rejection should be withdrawn.


Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito in view of Saito. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and the rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 14 and 15 have been added. Claims 14 and 15 recite a method for identifying a location using a first digital map that is different from a second digital map, the second digital map including data representing a second road segment corresponding to a first road segment of the first digital map, the data being different from a list of points on the first road segment. The cited references do not teach or suggest such a method.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34408.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:   
Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 7, 2007